

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION N	10.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/606,602		06/26/2003	Robert Wieber	1001-117	5017
25215	759	0 03/31/2004		EXAMINER	
		THENNISCH PC ODWARD AVE	PATEL, KIRAN B		
	SUITE 311			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
BIRMIN	GHAM	, MI 48009		3612	
				DATE MAII ED: 03/31/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/606,602	WIEBER, ROBERT				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Kiran B. Patel	3612				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above, the maximum statutory period w Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	i6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 De	ecember 2003.					
·_ ·	action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for alloward						
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) 1-21 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcting 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)				
 2)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	atent Application (PTO-152)				

Detailed Action

Election and Restriction

- Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under
 U.S.C. 121:
 - Claims 1-13, drawn to an attachment system, classified in Class 296,
 Subclass 29.
 - II. Claims 14-19, drawn to an attachment system, classified in Class 296,Subclass 210.
 - III. Claims 20-21, drawn to an attachment system, classified in Class 296, Subclass 220.01.
- 2. The inventions are distinct each from the other because of the following reasons: Inventions III, II and I are related as combination and subcombination.

 Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination I as

Art Unit: 3612

claimed does not require the particulars of a roof panel of subcombination II, an outer roof panel of subcombination III. The subcombination has a utility in other combinations such as a trailer roof and a structural joint respectively.

- 3. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
- 4. This application, as best understood, contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

Species A - directed towards Fig. 1

Species B - directed towards Fig. 2

Species C - directed towards Fig. 3A

Species D - directed towards Fig. 3B

Species E - directed towards Fig. 4.

5. Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic

' Art Unit: 3612

claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, there appears to be no claim, which is generic to all species.

Page 4

- 6. Applicant is advised that a response to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.
- 7. Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP [] 809.02(a).
- 8. Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record

showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the Examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

- 9. A telephone call was made for the Attorney/Agent responsible for this application to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.
- 10. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examiners even though the requirement is traversed (37 CFR 1.143).
- 11. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventor ship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventor ship must be

Application/Control Number: 10/606,602 Page 6

· Art Unit: 3612

accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(I).

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications should be directed to Primary Examiner Kiran B. Patel whose telephone number is 703-305-0254. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 8:00 to 5:00. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Kiran B. Patel, P. E. Primary Examiner Art Unit 3612 March 28, 2004